

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY  
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

THE TARIFF FILING OF SOUTH CENTRAL BELL     )  
TELEPHONE COMPANY TO INTRODUCE CALLER ID    ) CASE NO. 91-218

O R D E R

The Commission has before it two motions in this proceeding. AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc. ("AT&T") filed a motion for full intervention in this proceeding on February 20, 1992. By Order dated February 25, 1992, the Commission granted AT&T's motion to intervene stating that AT&T has a special interest which is not otherwise adequately represented and that intervention by AT&T is likely to present issues and develop facts that will assist the Commission without unduly complicated or disrupting the proceedings. On February 27, 1992, the Commission received from the Attorney General of the Commonwealth, by and through his Utility and Rate Intervention Division ("Attorney General"), a motion to reconsider its Order granting AT&T's intervention incorporating by reference his initial response to AT&T's motion, which had asserted that AT&T had not sought timely intervention and, therefore, the motion should be denied.

On March 9, 1992, AT&T responded to the Attorney General's motion to reconsider its intervention, agreeing that it takes the case as it found it on February 25, 1992, the date its

intervention was granted, and that it was not AT&T's purpose to reopen or reconsider matters already decided by the Commission. Accordingly, AT&T believes its intervention will not cause any disruption or delay.

The Commission finds that its initial order in this proceeding should be affirmed and that AT&T's participation in this proceeding will not cause any unnecessary disruption or delay.

On March 2, 1992, GTE South Incorporated ("GTE South") filed a motion to strike the testimony of the Attorney General. On March 12, 1992, the Attorney General responded in opposition.

In support of its motion, GTE South contends that the Attorney General's testimony presents data which was not available at the time of GTE South's hearing on Caller ID.<sup>1</sup> Further, GTE South argues that the Attorney General misconstrues the data. GTE South requests that if the Commission believes striking the testimony is not appropriate that it be permitted to file rebuttal testimony. The Attorney General asserts that the information utilized to compile his testimony was provided through a data request in this proceeding and that striking the testimony is not appropriate.

The Commission finds that the motion to strike should be denied but that GTE South should be granted an opportunity to file

---

<sup>1</sup> Case No. 90-096, Tariff Filing of GTE South Incorporated to Establish Custom Local Area Signaling Service, Order entered October 8, 1990.

rebuttal testimony and the Attorney General should be granted an opportunity to file surrebuttal testimony.

The Commission having considered these motions and having been otherwise sufficiently advised, HEREBY ORDERS that:


1. The Attorney General's motion to reconsider the Commission's Order granting AT&T's intervention is hereby denied.

2. GTE South's motion to strike portions of the testimony of the Attorney General is hereby denied.


3. GTE South's request to file rebuttal testimony and the Attorney General's request to file surrebuttal testimony are hereby granted. GTE South's rebuttal testimony shall be limited to issues raised in the Attorney General's testimony and shall be due no later than April 2, 1992 and the Attorney General's surrebuttal testimony shall be limited to issues raised in GTE South's rebuttal testimony and shall be due no later than April 10, 1992.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 18th day of March, 1992.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

  
Chairman

  
Vice Chairman

  
Commissioner

ATTEST:

  
Executive Director